arXiv:1702.02821v1 [cond-mat.dis-nn] 9 Feb 2017

Phase Transitions of the Typical Algorithmic Complexity of the Random Satisfiability Problem Studied with Linear Programming

Hendrik Schawe,* Roman Bleim,† and Alexander K. Hartmann‡
Institut für Physik, Universität Oldenburg, 26111 Oldenburg, Germany
(Dated: February 10, 2017)

The Boolean Satisfiability problem asks if a Boolean formula is satisfiable by some assignment of the variables or not. It belongs to the NP-complete complexity class and hence no algorithm with polynomial time worst-case complexity is known, i.e., the problem is hard. The K-SAT problem is the subset of the Boolean Satisfiability problem, for which the Boolean formula has the conjunctive normal form with K literals per clause. This problem is still NP-complete for $K \geq 3$. Although the worst case complexity of NP-complete problems is conjectured to be exponential, there might be subsets of the realizations where solutions can *typically* be found in polynomial time. In fact, random K-SAT, with the number of clauses to number of variables ratio α as control parameter, shows a phase transition between a satisfiable phase and an unsatisfiable phase, at which the hardest problems are located. We use here several linear programming approaches to reveal further "easy-hard" transition points at which the typical hardness of the problems increases which means that such algorithms can solve the problem on one side efficiently but not beyond this point. For one of these transitions, we observed a coincidence with a structural transition of the *literal factor graphs* of the problem instances. We also investigated cutting-plane approaches, which often increase the computational efficiency. Also we tried out a mapping to another NP-complete optimization problem using a specific algorithm for that problem. In both cases, no improvement of the performance was observed, i.e., no shift of the easy-hard transition to higher values of α.

PACS numbers: 02.10.Ox, 89.70.Eg, 64.60.-i

I. INTRODUCTION

The *Satisfiability problem* (SAT) is to decide whether some Boolean formula is satisfiable or not, i.e., whether for a given Boolean formula, there is an assignment of the variables such that the formula evaluates to "true". All Boolean formulas can be expressed in *conjunctive normal form* (CNF) preserving satisfiability with only linear increase in problem size [1], see next section for a precise definition of CNF. Therefore K-SAT, which is a Boolean formula in CNF with K variables per clause, is a commonly scrutinized version of the satisfiability problem.

Random K-SAT is an ensemble of Boolean formulas, where for a set of N variables M clauses are generated randomly. This means for each clause all K variables are chosen randomly, and each variable appears negated with probability 0.5. Interestingly, this problem shows a phase transition at some critical value α_s of the ratio $\alpha = M/N$ [2]. For large problems at $\alpha < \alpha_\mathrm{s}$ almost all problems are satisfiable (also denoted as SAT), above α_s almost all realizations are unsatisfiable (UNSAT). It was found that the hardest realizations are located near this α_s. This can be roughly understood because it is trivial to find some solution for much lower values of α and relatively easy to prove a realization unsatisfiable at high values of α.

While this SAT-UNSAT transition is certainly the most scrutinized in the K-SAT problem, there are more. For example 3-SAT, where SAT-UNSAT occurs at $\alpha_\mathrm{s} = 4.26$ [3], shows a transition to chaotic behavior at $\alpha_\chi \approx 3.28$ [4], i.e., using a continuous time deterministic solver [5] the trajectory will find the solution if one exists, but it will show chaotic transient behavior above this threshold resulting in increasing escape rates from attractors. This leads to higher computational cost and can therefore be used as a measure of hardness. Furthermore, there exists a clustering transition at $\alpha_\mathrm{c} \approx 3.86$ [6, 7]. This means that here the organization of the space of the exponentially many degenerate solutions changes from one big cluster ($\alpha < \alpha_\mathrm{c}$) of solutions which are connected in assignment space to a solution space ($\alpha > \alpha_\mathrm{c}$) which is fragmented into many non-connected smaller clusters.

The occurrence of phase transitions has been observed frequently for random ensembles of NP-complete problems [2, 8–10], for which 3-SAT is the prime example [11, 12]. This incited strong interest in the K-SAT problem [3, 6, 13, 14] and many other NP-complete problems [15–20] among physicists.

Usually algorithms like branch-and-bound, stochastic search or message passing are used in the statistical-mechanics literature. These algorithms operate in the space of feasible assignments and approach the optimum solution from above. Here "optimum" means that the number of unsatisfied clauses is minimized, i.e., eventually becomes zero if a satisfying assignment is found. Thus for general minimization problems these algorithms yield upper bounds until the true minimum solution is found. On the other hand, the operations-research literature often uses *linear programming* (LP) [21, 22] techniques for real-world applications since they are versatile

*Electronic address: hendrik.schawe@uni-oldenburg.de
†Electronic address: roman.bleim@uni-oldenburg.de
‡Electronic address: a.hartmann@uni-oldenburg.de

and efficient, which means they run typically in polynomial time. For combinatorial problems, e.g., NP-hard optimization problems, LP yields solutions which are not necessarily feasible, e.g., non-integer assignments to the variables, but which establish a lower bound on the objective. Thus LP somehow approaches for minimization problems the true feasible and optimum solution from below. Nevertheless, a key observation is that whenever LP gives a feasible solution, it must be the true optimum solution of the combinatorial problem. Because of their complementary properties combinations of LP with other approaches yield powerful methods, such as branch-and-cut [23], to solve hard problems. Therefore LP and how it behaves for ensembles of random NP-hard problems should be given more attention in the physics community.

In particular interesting are transitions between regions where an NP-hard problem can be typically solved by LP alone, to regions where this is not possible. Such "easy-hard" transitions are especially interesting if they can be correlated with changes of the problem or solution-space structure. According to the knowledge of the authors, previously such studies of the behavior of LP have only been conducted for the vertex cover (VC) [24] and the traveling salesperson problem (TSP) [25]. In this work we study an easy-hard transition for a linear programming approach to K-SAT and a connection to the structure of the realizations.

II. METHODS

A realization of K-SAT consists of a Boolean formula over N variables x_i $(i = 1, \ldots, N)$. The formula is in conjunctive normal form, i.e., it is a conjunction of M clauses c_j $(j = 1, \ldots, M)$, where every clause is a disjunction of K literals l_{kj} $(k = 1, \ldots, K)$, i.e., variables, which are either positive x_i or negated $\overline{x}_i$. In each clause, each variable may appear only once. As an example for $N = 4$, $M = 2$ and $K = 3$ take

$$(\overline{x}_1 \vee x_2 \vee \overline{x}_3) \wedge (x_1 \vee x_3 \vee \overline{x}_4). \tag{1}$$

This example is solvable with, e.g., $x_1 =$ "true" $= 1$ and $x_3 =$ "false" $= 0$, and arbitrary assignments for the other variables. Note that each clause is satisfiable by $2^K - 1$ out of 2^K possible assignments to the variables. Thus, each clause restricts the space of satisfiable assignments a bit. Clearly, with more clauses per variable, i.e., a higher amount of constraints, it is more probable that a random formula is unsatisfiable. In fact, for random 3-SAT with $N \to \infty$ there is a critical density $\alpha_\mathrm{s} = M/N \approx 4.26$ [3] at which a phase transition from satisfiable to unsatisfiable (SAT-UNSAT) happens.

A linear program (LP) is an optimization problem, which can be expressed by a set of linear constraints and a linear objective function, which should be optimized. There are fast, i.e., polynomial time complexity, algorithms to solve a linear program, e.g., the ellipsoid method [26] or interior point methods [27, 28]. However in many practical solvers the simplex algorithm is used, which typically terminates quickly for practical problems, despite its exponential time complexity in the worst case [21, 22]. Though, as soon as some variables need to be integer valued, this problem gets hard. In fact, *integer linear programming* is a NP-hard problem [12].

A K-SAT realization can be expressed as an integer linear program. Therefore every positive literal x_i is expressed as an integer variable x_i and every negative literal $\overline{x}_i$ as $(1 - x_i)$. Since one or more literals of every clause $c \in C$ needs to be true for a satisfying assignment, the corresponding integer linear program contains for each clause the constraint that the sum of the expressions for the included literals must be greater or equal 1. The example from Eq. (1) generates following linear inequalities.

$$\begin{aligned}(1 - x_1) + x_2 + (1 - x_3) &\geq 1\\ x_1 + x_3 + (1 - x_4) &\geq 1\end{aligned}$$

Since a LP is an optimization problem but SAT is merely a decision problem, we can choose an arbitrary objective function for which to optimize. The simplest objective function is zero, i.e., no optimization.

$$\begin{aligned}&\text{min.} && 0 && \\ &\text{s.t.} && \sum_{x_i \in c_j} x_i + \sum_{\overline{x}_i \in c_j} (1 - x_i) \geq 1, && \forall 1 \leq j \leq M\\ & && x_i \in \{0, 1\}, && \forall 1 \leq i \leq N\end{aligned}$$

The last constraint fixes the variables to integer values. We will relax this constraint to $x_i \in [0, 1]$. This allows us to apply a fast LP algorithm to solve the relaxed problem and introduce a measure of hardness for the problem realization. If the LP relaxation yields a solution consisting of only integer variables, the solution is obtained by a polynomial time method and the corresponding realization is obviously easy to solve.

A drawback is that additionally to the principal degeneracy of the problem, i.e., there are possibly many assignments that satisfy the formula, the relaxation leads to a much higher degeneracy. For example, the assignment of all $x_i = 0.5$ is always a solution of the relaxation.

To reduce this degeneracy and to facilitate finding an integer solution we tried different artificially added objective functions. So the zero objective function can be replaced by one maximizing the sum over all variables (MV)

$$\text{max.} \qquad \sum_{i=1}^{N} x_i.$$

Note that this and other additional objective functions have no influence on whether a formula is satisfiable or not, they are just meant as a tool to facilitate finding integer solutions, which works out as we will see below.

As a third objective we tried maximizing the number of fulfilled literals per clause, which we will call *Satisfaction Multiplicity Maximization* (SMM). This can be achieved with a slightly modified linear program by introducing one new variable z_i per clause counting the number of fulfilled literals of its clause and maximizing the sum over all z_i.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{max.} \quad & \sum_{i=1}^{M} z_i \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_{x_i \in c_j} x_i + \sum_{\overline{x}_i \in c_j} (1 - x_i) \geq z_j, \qquad \forall 1 \leq j \leq M \\ & x_i \in \{0,1\}, \quad \forall 1 \leq i \leq N \\ & z_i \geq 1, \qquad \forall 1 \leq j \leq M \end{aligned}$$

The new kind of constraint ensures that $z_i \geq 1$, i.e., that every clause contains at least one fulfilled literal, such that the solution assignment satisfies the Boolean formula. This type of additional optimization is similar to MAX-SAT, where one tries to maximize the number of satisfied clauses. For MAX-SAT one would instead enforce $0 \leq z_i \leq 1$ $\forall i$. We also tried this MAX-SAT approach to solve the K-SAT decision problem, but we did not observe any better performance than by using the other approaches, thus we do not show results for this approach here.

Note that when using LP, finding integer solutions may be facilitated in principle by adding so called *cutting planes*. This was previously observed also for ensembles of random instances for the vertex cover [24] and the TSP [25]. Nevertheless, for the present study no improvement, i.e., no additional phase transitions could be observed here, see below. Thus, we do not describe the cutting-plane approach in this section in detail, beyond what is mentioned below.



FIG. 1: The graph for the vertex cover problem which is equivalent to the formula shown in Eq. (1). Shown is a vertex cover of size $N+(K-1)M = 4+2\times 2 = 8$, which corresponds to a satisfying assignment $x_1 = 1$, $x_2 = 1$, $x_3 = 0$, $x_4 = 1$.

All NP-complete problems, by definition, can be mapped onto each other in polynomial time. Thus, it is reasonable to ask, whether via transforming SAT instances to instances of another problem and applying algorithms specifically suited for the other problem changes the performance, as measured by the location of the easy-hard transition. Here we used a classical mapping [29] of SAT to the vertex cover problem. For each K-SAT instance an equivalent graph $G = (V, E)$ is constructed in the following way: The set V of nodes contains one pair of nodes $i, \overline{i}$ for each variable x_i $(i = 1, \ldots, N)$, which represents the variable and its negation. Furthermore, V contains one node (kj) for each literal l_{kj} in each clause c_j, respectively. Therefore V contains $2N + KM$ nodes. For the set E of edges, for each clause c_j a complete subgraph of size K is formed by connecting all pairs of "literal nodes" (kj) pairwise which correspond to this clause. Also, each "variable node" i is connected with its corresponding "negated variable node" $\overline{i}$. Finally, for each literal l_{kj}, if the literal represents a non-negated variable x_i, an edge connecting (kj) with i is included, while if the literal represents a negated variable $\overline{x}_i$ the corresponding literal node (kj) is connected with $\overline{i}$. Thus, E contains $MK(K-1)/2+N+MK$ edges. Now a minimum vertex cover is obtained. This is a subset $V' \subset V$ of nodes such that for each edge of E at least one of the two endpoints is in V'. By construction [29], G contains a vertex cover of size $N + (K-1)M$ if and only if the corresponding formula is satisfiable. In Fig. 1 the graph corresponding to the formula from Eq. (1) is shown.

Thus, one approach to SAT is to transform each formula into the equivalent graph and use an existing algorithm for VC to solve it. We applied an LP formulation with cycle cutting plains, see Ref. [24] for details. For the previous work, this algorithm was able to solve VC instances in the parameter-space region, where the solutions were contained basically in one cluster, corresponding to the replica-symmetric region [30].

III. RESULTS

We sample random 3-SAT instances, where each clause may contain any variable at most once. For 10 system sizes $N \in [128, 65536]$ (respectively 9 system sizes $N \in [128, 32768]$ for 4-SAT when studied with MV and SMM) we simulated $n = 5000$ realizations for 50, (respectively 30) different values of the density α. All error estimates are obtained by bootstrap resampling [31–33], except for errors of fit parameters shown in the plots, which are *gnuplot*'s asymptotic standard errors corrected according to Ref. [32]. To solve the LP realizations, the implementation of the dual-simplex algorithm of the commercial optimization library *CPLEX* was used.

Plotting the probability that the LP solution of a realization is integer, i.e., the actual solution, as a function of α in Fig. 2 shows a decrease at some apparent critical value α_{lp}. This decrease is steeper for larger system sizes N, which is a behavior typical for phase transitions. The transition depicted here is an algorithmic transition from *easy*, since all realizations are solvable by LP techniques, i.e., in polynomial time, to some *harder* phase, where the LP does not yield solutions. A detail that needs special attention, is that for the largest system size $N = 65536$ p increases again for $\alpha \gtrsim 1.7$ and falls to $p = 0$ for

$\alpha \gtrsim 1.8$. This seems to be a non-monotonous behavior of the CPLEX solver, which uses many "hidden" heuristics and implementation details to speed up the convergence and which do not represent the "pure" LP solvability. Likely this is amplified by the high degeneracy when just using a zero objective function. In fact, if using the MV or SMM objective functions and thus removing most of the degeneracy of the solution, this phenomenon does not occur anymore. However, we are confident that this anomaly is far enough away from the interesting region around α_{lp} to influence our conclusions.



FIG. 2: Solution probability p of LP as a function of α. The best estimate of the critical point α_{lp} is drawn as a vertical line. The thickness of the line corresponds to the error estimate. Inset: Data collapse with parameters $b = 0.39(4)$ and $\alpha_c = 1.640(1)$ obtained by methods from Ref. [34] for $N \geq 1024$.

To determine the transition point α_{lp} in the thermodynamic limit $N \to \infty$, we try different methods. This is necessary since some methods do not work well on the variations of K-SAT examined in the following. It seems to be reasonable to compare all methods using one variant of K-SAT which allows the application of all methods and show that all yield compatible results.

First, we use the position of the peaks of the variance $\mathrm{Var}(p)$ of the solution probability like in previous work [24, 25]. Since the single measurements can only take the values 1 or 0, the maximum of the variance is $\max \mathrm{Var}(p) = 0.25$ at $p = 0.5$. Therefore, this method effectively extrapolates the position of the $p = 0.5$ point, which should be at the transition point for $N \to \infty$. The positions are extrapolated with a power law $\alpha_{\max}(N) = \alpha_{\mathrm{lp}} - aN^{-\tilde{b}}$ to obtain an estimate of the infinite-size transition point α_{lp}.

Second order phase transitions usually show some power-law finite-size scaling near the critical point [35], i.e., rescaling the α axis according to $(\alpha - \alpha_{\mathrm{lp}})N^b$, should result in a collapse of the data points on one curve. To find values α_{lp} and b generating a good collapse the algorithm and implementation from Ref. [34] is used. It yields $b = 0.39(4)$ and $\alpha_{\mathrm{lp}} = 1.640(1)$, which are in good agreement with the value for the critical point obtained by extrapolation of the peak positions of the variance in



FIG. 3: Variance of the probability to be solvable by LP. Inset: Power-law fit to the positions of the peaks of the variance. This extrapolates $\tilde{b} = 0.57(4)$ and $\alpha_c^{\mathrm{lp}} = 1.642(1)$ with a goodness of fit $\chi^2_{\mathrm{red}} = 1.6$ for $N \geq 1024$.

Fig. 3. The collapse obtained when rescaling with those values is shown in the inset of Fig. 2.

Also note that this critical point coincides with the point where all curves of p intersect for different sizes N, which appears reasonable because p is a dimensionless quantity (cf. Fig. 2). Thus, a further method to find the critical point is determining the intersection of different system sizes. Since the measurements are only taken at discrete values of α, we determine the intersection of cubic spline interpolations through the measurements. The intersections $\alpha_\times$ are obtained for all combinations of system sizes. Their mean is at $\alpha_{\mathrm{lp}} = 1.63(1)$ which is within errorbars compatible with both estimates mentioned before.

We performed a similar analysis for 4-SAT. The results for p are shown in Fig. 4. Unfortunately, since the curves are much less steep, the variance maximum is far more to the right of the apparent transition and its convergence to the actual transition point is too bad (not shown here) to get meaningful results. However the intersection method yields $\alpha_{\mathrm{lp}} = 1.549(9)$ and the collapse yields $\alpha_{\mathrm{lp}} = 1.551(8)$, which are very well compatible with each other, such that this seems to be a reasonable estimate for the LP's easy-hard transition point.

The previous work on vertex cover and TSP showed [24, 25] that some LP easy-hard transitions coincide with changes of the problem or solution structure. As we will detail next, we found for K-SAT also such a correspondence. Here it turned out that the (zero optimization) LP transition point is at the same threshold where the *pure-literal rule*, also called *affirmative-negative rule*, which is an integral part of the DPLL [36, 37] search algorithm, can be used to solve all realizations. For an easy understanding, we first introduce a graph representation, of the satisfiability problem, we will call the *literal factor graph* (LFG). While one of the most scrutinized graph representations of SAT is its *factor graph* [9, 38], especially for belief or survey propagation [39, 40], the authors do not know of any study about the LFG. Both are conceptually



FIG. 4: Solution probability p as a function of α for 4-SAT. The best estimate for the critical point $\alpha_{\rm lp}$ is drawn as a vertical line. The thickness of the line corresponds to the error estimate. Inset: Collapse with parameters $b = 0.21(2)$ and $\alpha_c = 1.551(8)$ obtained by methods from Ref. [34] for $N \geq 4096$.

similar. In the factor graph, which is a bipartite graph exhibiting a node for each variable and each clause, i.e., containing $N+M$ nodes, each variable is connected to the clauses it occurs in. For the LFG, which contains $2N+M$ nodes for *literals* and clauses, each literal is connected to the clauses it occurs in. The LFG representation of the example from Eq. (1) is given in Fig. 5.



FIG. 5: The literal factor graph of the example from Eq. (1).

A *pure literal* is a variable which occurs only in one polarity, either positive (also called affirmative) or negative in the formula. In the graph this means, if only one polarity of a variable (x_i or $\overline{x}_i$) is connected to one or more clauses, this literal can be set to true, thus fulfilling all adjacent clauses, which can be removed from the graph without affecting the satisfiability of the realization. Also, all isolated nodes are removed from the graph. This procedure can be iterated until no pairs of literals, of which only one is connected to any clause, are left. The remainder of the graph is called *pure literal core*. If the pure literal core is satisfiable, the realization is satisfiable. Especially, an empty pure literal core is trivially satisfiable.

The example Fig. 5 would find that $\overline{x}_2$ is isolated and thus remove all neighbors of x_2, in this case c_1. In the next step, since after removal of c_1 the node $\overline{x}_1$ is isolated, c_2, the neighbor of x_1, is removed. The remaining pure literal core is empty and this realization satisfiable.

In Fig. 6 the size of the pure literal core S, i.e., the fraction of nodes still remaining, is plotted as a function of α. It is clearly visible that there happens a transition from "no core" to "core". Using the intersections of the different curves, we estimate $\alpha_{pl} = 1.641(8)$, which coincides within errorbars with the critical $\alpha_{\rm lp}$ for LP solvability for 3-SAT. The same is true for 4-SAT at $\alpha_{pl} = 1.551(7)$ (cf. inset of Fig. 6). Other values of K were not examined.



FIG. 6: Size of the pure literal core after simplification according to the pure-literal rule for 3-SAT in the main plot and 4-SAT in the inset. Note that $\alpha_{\rm pl}$ is not visualized.

This suggests that LP with a zero objective function is as strong solving K-SAT as the pure-literal rule, though the authors have no explanation for this correspondence.

Interestingly, we found that the threshold of the core/no core transition for *leaf removal* heuristics [41], where iteratively neighbors of leaf-nodes are removed, for the LFG appears at the same location (not shown). Leaf removal is a simplification rule for Vertex cover, but not suited to solve or simplify a K-SAT realization.

Next, the behavior of LP with different additional objective functions is analyzed. Solving the SMM problem results in an extension of the range of α where integer solutions are found, since assignment of all variables to 1 or 0 contributes more to the objective function than assignments of non-integer values. Fig. 7 shows the probability to obtain integer solutions. Also this strongly reduces the degeneracy of the solution of the optimization problem, i.e., many of the solutions where the majority of variables are non-integer, are not optimal under this new objective function. This also means that these results are less dependent on the actual details of the LP solvers' implementation – imagine a simplex solver starting always from all variables equal 0.5, which would produce $p = 0$ for all α in case of zero optimization, but would yield the same results for the SMM that are shown here.

In contrast to Fig. 2 the curves do not intersect in one point, though they still get steeper with increasing system size N suggesting a sharp transition to a regime where no valid solutions are generated by this LP for $N \to \infty$. To estimate the point of this transition $\alpha_{\rm SMM}$, the positions of the maxima of the variance for differ-



FIG. 7: Probability p that SMM yields an integer solution. Inset: Collapse with $b = 0.10(1)$, $\alpha_{\rm SMM} = 2.24(6)$ for $N \geq 4096$.

ent system sizes were used to extrapolate to $N \to \infty$ as shown in Fig. 8, which yields $\alpha_{\rm SMM} = 2.336(7)$. And is in reasonable agreement with an estimate obtained from a collapse of the curves $\alpha_{\rm SMM} = 2.24(6)$ as shown in the inset of Fig. 7. The same analysis for 4-SAT, yields $\alpha_{\rm SMM} = 3.60(8)$, $\tilde{b} = 0.5(1)$ with $\chi^2_{\rm red} = 0.5$ (not shown, simulations used smaller system sizes).



FIG. 8: Variance of the solution probability p for the SMM objective. Inset: The power-law fit $\alpha_{\rm max} = aN^{-\tilde{b}} + \alpha_{\rm SMM}$ to the position of the peaks $\alpha_{\rm max}$. The fit yields $\tilde{b} = 0.65(7)$, $\alpha_{\rm SMM} = 2.336(7)$ with $\chi^2_{\rm red} = 1.0$.

The last optimization function of this study, MV, i.e., maximizing the sum of all variables, leads to a qualitatively similar behavior as SMM but a transition at lower $\alpha_{\rm MV} = 1.25(2)$ (not pictured, simulations used smaller system sizes). The lower transition point is plausible, since this maximization prefers variables to be larger than zero instead of 0. For this reason, we have not analyzed this algorithm for 4-SAT. The best estimates for the transition points are collected in Tab. I.

In similar studies on vertex cover [24] and the TSP [25], the introduction of cutting planes yielded substantially better results. For vertex cover the introduction of (potentially exponentially many but actually few) cutting planes (CP) even lead to a LP+CP transition at the point where in the analytical solution replica symmetry breaking, i.e., clustering of solutions appeared [30]. This efficiency of CP was not observable here. It seems that the cutting planes we tried, namely *resolution cuts* [43] and *clique cuts* [44], were too weak at the low values of α examined here. Another cutting plane for the SAT problem, the *odd cycle inequalities* [45] are not directly applicable for K-SAT with $K \geq 3$, since they need clauses with 2 variables to be constructed. While they are useful as local cuts in a branch-and-cut procedure, they are never violated in the beginning for $K \geq 3$ and thus not applicable for this study.

TABLE I: Values of critical points. $\alpha_{\rm lp}$ is the easy-hard transition of LP. $\alpha_{\rm pl}$ denotes the critical point for the pure literal heuristics. $\alpha_{\rm VC}$ denotes the critical point when mapping SAT to VC and applying a LP + cutting plane solver used for VC. $\alpha_{\rm MV}$ is the easy-hard transition for LP+MV. $\alpha_{\rm SMM}$ is the easy-hard transition for LP+SMM. $\alpha_{\rm c}$ denotes the clustering transition [6] and $\alpha_{\rm s}$ the SAT-UNSAT transition [3, 42].

K	$\alpha_{\rm lp}$	$\alpha_{\rm pl}$	$\alpha_{\rm VC}$	$\alpha_{\rm MV}$	$\alpha_{\rm SMM}$	$\alpha_{\rm c}$	$\alpha_{\rm s}$
3	1.640(1)	1.641(8)	0.90(3)	1.25(2)	2.336(7)	3.86	4.26
4	1.551(8)	1.551(7)	–	–	3.60(8)	9.547	9.93

Finally, we also used for $K = 3$ the mapping of K-SAT to the vertex cover problem for formulas up to $N = 10000$. Using LP and cycle cutting planes [24] the corresponding equivalent instances were solved. Again we measured the probability that an instance was solved by an integer solution as a function of α, for different system sizes. Using an analysis (not shown) as for the previous approaches, we were able to extrapolate an easy-hard transition for this point. We obtained a critical value of $\alpha_{\rm VC} = 0.90(3)$, which is well below the easy-hard transitions obtained using the direct approaches. Therefore, apparently it does not pay off using a mapping to another problem, at least for this pair of problems.

Only for the LP algorithm compared to the pure literal heuristic an easy-hard transition and a kind of structural transition seem to coincide. For the other easy-hard transitions we found, we were not able to identify structural transitions of the ensemble of SAT instances or of the solution space structure, which coincide with the observed easy-hard transition. First, the percolation transition for the factor graph appears [9] at a value of $1/(K(K-1))$ which is $1/6 \approx 0.1667$ for 3-SAT and $1/12 \approx 0.0833$ for 4-SAT. The corresponding percolation transitions for the literal factor graph are at twice the values, since the number of possible literals is twice the number of variables. These are well below the easy-hard transitions we observed. On the other hand, the clustering transition point $\alpha_{\rm c}$ and for sure the SAT-UNSAT transition point $\alpha_{\rm s}$ are well above the easy-hard transitions found here. So it remains to be determined whether in particular the easy-hard transition for LP+SMM corresponds to a structural change of the problem. Thus, in summary,

the behavior of random K-SAT appears from the linear-programming perspective to be richer as compared to VC and TSP. This is parallel to the richer behavior observed when treating these problems analytically.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

We solved random K-SAT realizations at different values of the clause-to-variable density α using linear programming and analyzed the probabilities that the LP will yield an integer solution to determine if the realization is easy. Similar to previous work on NP-hard problems, we found a critical α_{lp} after which the problem becomes unsolvable by LP alone. For this transition we also found a structural property changing for both $K = 3$ and $K = 4$ at α_{lp}. A change of the objective function, which is arbitrary for a decision problem, lead to significant improvement of the relaxation solution of the LP, corresponding to a shift of the easy-hard transitions to higher values of α. There, we wonder if carefully crafted objective functions could be used to improve the efficiency of solving decision problems with a LP approach, such as branch-and-cut.

For the shifted easy-hard transition, we were not able to identify a structural transition, which should be expected to exist. Also, we did not observe any easy-hard transition corresponding to a percolation transition of the underlying graph, nor to a clustering transition of the solution space. Thus, here is still some work to be done. Furthermore, in contrast to the previously studied vertex cover problem and the traveling salesperson problem, we did not observe any improvement by applying cutting planes. This could be due to the type of cutting planes used. Finally, we applied a mapping of SAT to VC and used specific VC LP+cutting plane algorithm, which is able to solve standard Erdős-Rényi VC instances just up to the clustering threshold. Nevertheless, for SAT this did not pay off, the easy-hard transition appears to be even at smaller values of α compared to just using LP.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the German Science Foundation (DFG) through the grant HA 3169/8-1. The simulations were performed at the HPC Cluster HERO, located at the University of Oldenburg (Germany) and funded by the DFG through its Major Research Instrumentation Programme (INST 184/108-1 FUGG) and the Ministry of Science and Culture (MWK) of the Lower Saxony State.

[1] G. S. Tseitin, Zapiski Nauchnykh Seminarov POMI **8**, 234 (1968).
[2] P. Cheeseman, B. Kanefsky, and W. M. Taylor, in *IJCAI* (1991), vol. 91, pp. 331–337.
[3] M. Mézard, G. Parisi, and R. Zecchina, Science **297**, 812 (2002).
[4] M. Varga, R. Sumi, Z. Toroczkai, and M. Ercsey-Ravasz, Physical Review E **93**, 052211 (2016).
[5] M. Ercsey-Ravasz and Z. Toroczkai, Nature Physics **7**, 966 (2011).
[6] F. Krzakała, A. Montanari, F. Ricci-Tersenghi, G. Semerjian, and L. Zdeborová, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences **104**, 10318 (2007), see papercore summary `http://www.papercore.org/Krzakala2007`.
[7] A. Mann and A. Hartmann, Physical Review E **82**, 056702 (2010).
[8] A. K. Hartmann and M. Weigt, *Phase Transitions in Combinatorial Optimization Problems* (Wiley-VCH, Weinheim, 2005).
[9] M. Mézard and A. Montanari, *Information, Physics and Computation* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2009).
[10] C. Moore and S. Mertens, *The Nature of Computation* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2011).
[11] S. A. Cook, in *Proceedings of the Third Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing* (ACM, New York, NY, USA, 1971), STOC '71, pp. 151–158.
[12] R. M. Karp, *Reducibility among combinatorial problems* (Springer, 1972).
[13] G. Biroli, S. Cocco, and R. Monasson, Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications **306**, 381 (2002), ISSN 0378-4371, invited Papers from the 21th IUPAP International Conference on Statistical Physics.
[14] S. Cocco and R. Monasson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 1654 (2001).
[15] O. C. Martin, R. Monasson, and R. Zecchina, Theoretical computer science **265**, 3 (2001).
[16] I. P. Gent and T. Walsh, Artificial Intelligence **88**, 349 (1996), ISSN 0004-3702.
[17] L. Zdeborová and F. Krzakała, Phys. Rev. E **76**, 031131 (2007).
[18] M. Weigt and A. K. Hartmann, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 6118 (2000), see papercore summary `http://www.papercore.org/Weigt2000`.
[19] A. K. Hartmann and M. Weigt, Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General **36**, 11069 (2003).
[20] M. Weigt and A. K. Hartmann, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 1658 (2001).
[21] C. Papadimitriou and K. Steiglitz, *Combinatorial Optimization: Algorithms and Complexity*, Dover Books on Computer Science Series (Dover Publications, 1998), ISBN 9780486402581.
[22] T. H. Cormen, C. E. Leiserson, R. L. Rivest, and C. Stein, *Introduction to algorithms* (MIT press Cambridge, 2009).
[23] M. Padberg and G. Rinaldi, SIAM Review **33**, 60 (1991).
[24] T. Dewenter and A. K. Hartmann, Physical Review E **86**, 041128 (2012), see papercore summary `http://www.papercore.org/Dewenter2012`.
[25] H. Schawe and A. K. Hartmann, Eur. Phys. Lett. **113**, 30004 (2016).
[26] L. G. Khachiyan, USSR Computational Mathematics and Mathematical Physics **20**, 53 (1980).
[27] N. Karmarkar, in *Proceedings of the sixteenth annual*

ACM symposium on Theory of computing (ACM, 1984), pp. 302–311.

[28] Y. Nesterov and A. Nemirovskii, *Interior-point polynomial algorithms in convex programming*, vol. 13 (Siam, 1994).

[29] M. R. Garey and D. S. Johnson, *Computers and intractability* (W.H. Freemann, San Francisco, 1979).

[30] M. Weigt and A. K. Hartmann, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 6118 (2000).

[31] B. Efron, Ann. Statist. **7**, 1 (1979).

[32] A. P. Young, *Everything You Wanted to Know About Data Analysis and Fitting but Were Afraid to Ask*, SpringerBriefs in Physics (Springer International Publishing, 2015), ISBN 978-3-319-19050-1.

[33] A. K. Hartmann, *Big Practical Guide to Computer Simulations* (World Scientific, 2015).

[34] O. Melchert, *autoscale.py - a program for automatic finite-size scaling analyses: A user's guide* (2009), arXiv:0910.5403 [physics.comp-ph], URL `http://arxiv.org/abs/0910.5403`.

[35] N. Goldenfeld, *Lectures on phase transitions and the renormalization group* (Addison-Wesely, Reading (MA), 1992).

[36] M. Davis and H. Putnam, J. ACM **7**, 201 (1960), ISSN 0004-5411.

[37] M. Davis, G. Logemann, and D. Loveland, Commun. ACM **5**, 394 (1962), ISSN 0001-0782.

[38] A. Montanari, G. Parisi, and F. Ricci-Tersenghi, Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General **37**, 2073 (2004).

[39] M. Mézard and R. Zecchina, Phys. Rev. E **66**, 056126 (2002).

[40] A. Braunstein, M. Mézard, and R. Zecchina, Random Structures & Algorithms **27**, 201 (2005).

[41] M. Bauer and O. Golinelli, The European Physical Journal B-Condensed Matter and Complex Systems **24**, 339 (2001).

[42] S. Mertens, M. Mézard, and R. Zecchina, Random Structures & Algorithms **28**, 340 (2006).

[43] J. N. Hooker, Operations Research Letters **7**, 1 (1988).

[44] A. Atamtürk, G. L. Nemhauser, and M. W. Savelsbergh, European Journal of Operational Research **121**, 40 (2000).

[45] S. Joy, J. Mitchell, and B. Borchers, in *Satisfiability Problem: Theory and Applications* (1997), vol. 35 of DIMACS Series on Discrete Mathematics and Theoretical Computer Science.